



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE JOURNAL OF POLITICAL ECONOMY

VOLUME 21

January 1913

NUMBER 1

THE AIM AND CONTENT OF THE UNDERGRADUATE ECONOMICS CURRICULUM

Three years ago, in a paper on the aim and content of the course on elementary economics,¹ I suggested that the aim of any course should be definitely related to the purpose of college education as a whole. This thought has just as much application to the work of a whole department or division of instruction. Departmental organization can hardly be discussed without reference to departmental aims and these cannot logically be divorced from the aim of undergraduate instruction at large. If we could simply assume that the aim of college education is settled, we could proceed at once to discuss our internal departmental affairs. But it is not, and consequently, in order to present my point of view, I find it necessary to indulge in what may seem an unduly long introduction to my conclusions.

The initial difficulty in finding our bearings is the fact that there is by no means agreement concerning what the college ought to do. Colleges are between the devil and the deep sea—between the extreme advocates of pure “culture,” on the one side, and the advocates of strictly vocational or technical training, on the other. Up to recent years the college ideal has been a hybrid—made up in about equal parts of the old religio-moralistic notion of character-building and the less consciously espoused doctrine of culture for culture’s sake—a first cousin to the art-for-art’s-sake illusion—a

¹ *Journal of Political Economy*, XVII, 673.

motive based on love of distinction and the fact that a college education set its fortunate possessor apart from his or her fellows. Meanwhile democracy is upon us. Both industrial and social evolution have produced a demand for less aristocratic and more practically idealistic aims. Democracy, with its emphasis on the individual as end, and the collectivity of individuals, society, as means, has gradually become conscious of the economy of its processes in relation to the satisfaction of individual ends; and it has come to demand, in consequence, full, adequate, and effective training and adaptation of all individuals for their respective functions in the entire social process. We must remember that democracy is itself a problem. It has been called into revived significance by the developing self-consciousness of the masses and by a growing realization of the worth of life to those who have real opportunity and training to live. It has bowled over the old idea of culture for the selected few and demanded it for the many. In reaching out for the conventionally good things in life, it has disturbed the old order; it has disorganized social standards and values. Not having as yet learned to live in democracy, nor as yet developed a settled calculus of moral values under democratic ideals and conventions, we are naturally beset with problems of friction, conflict, and unrest. Democracy turns in upon itself for a solution, and thence arise more problems—questions of machinery and method. Our present political situation may be summarized, for instance, as the attempt to secure a machinery of democratic political control which will secure the desired economic and social democracy—the ideal of the age. In all this the point for the teacher to seize is that neither political nor economic democracy will ever be possible without trained, informed citizenship—without the adaptation of all adult individuals to the political and economic system under which they seek to live. Only through such adaptation will democracy be efficient and economical—securing the largest production of human welfare.

Our educational machinery needs overhauling to make it conform to this necessary task of adjustment to democracy, because in the past our educational system has developed by a sort of process of capillarity—a seepage down of college and classical ideals,

to be the model, worked out in a former age and under aristocratic conditions, for a system of secondary education *supposedly*, but not really, adapted to the needs and interests of the whole people. The effort to attain a real democracy, in college education and in high school alike, comes upon the obstructions of old educational illusions—first the notion that a subject is suitable for a college, or a general high-school course, in inverse ratio to its present-day utility, and secondly, the formal discipline theory—that the real aim of education is mental training irrespective of content, and that abstract mathematics and formal linguistics are the best mediums for this training. Thus a policy of doubtful efficiency at any time is carried over from the aristocratic state, when education is the badge of the few, into the present when democracy's crying need for informed and *orientated* citizenship, and of specific vocational training, demands radical and repeated reorganization of educational aims and curricula.

The conflict between the advocates of pure culture and formal discipline and those of vocational training and motivizing can be found on every live college faculty. It is significant of the strong current of unrest among us. Unfortunately it is producing in some quarters an undesirable segregation of liberal and technical education. The pure culture course, in my opinion, is largely futile; the separate technical course is likely, in the absence of the liberalizing influence of the modern humanities, to be narrowing and commercializing. The cultural and vocational ideals should be combined in college and high-school instruction, and both should be directly leavened and vivified by the citizenship ideal. The student is going out to be a citizen, and the need of citizenship training of the broadest and most pointed kind is obvious. The increasing rôle of government, the enlarging responsibilities of citizenship (immensely greater now than fifty years ago), and the consequent indispensable need for knowledge of economic and social conditions and power to think straight about them—all this is familiar enough. All the more, then, should it stimulate us—teachers of the fundamentals of modern democracy and modern leadership—to plan our work with citizenship primarily in mind. We cannot put the emphasis on “culture”—even broad

academic culture—or on “scholarship,” in the scholastic sense, in the fond belief that these things are all that is necessary as a foundation to efficient citizenship. Nor can we, on the other hand, toss overboard all general and foundational liberalizing courses, and plunge straight into vocational training. We can and must utilize the life-career motive, but it must not be allowed to defeat its own larger service to the education of citizens.

What are the colleges doing to supply this need for broadly trained, alert, and informed citizenship? Have we any plan and faith in our education, except the general plan (possibly) of requiring a few elementary courses, and the blind faith that somehow four years of “college atmosphere” and free elections from a heterogeneous variety of courses will do the rest? Just why do college students study the plays of Molière, or quantitative analysis, or colonial government, or social psychology, or the history of the American colonies? I am not saying that any or all of these courses I happen to name are not essential parts of a liberal education. I am merely hinting that the admission of a course to the college curriculum is often made on any other basis than a demonstrated place for it in the kind of education urgently called for today in America. The stamp of the pride of erudition is on too many college courses; and too many teachers regard a course as “cultural” in proportion as no utility can be pointed out for it; just as some, on the other hand, are going to the other extreme and regarding a course as a waste of time unless it has very directly a technical use.

Now apply this line of thought to our own department. Are we sure why we teach economic history, or corporation finance, or criminology? Or just why do we include a course on immigration, say, and leave out the economics of consumption, or include the history of commerce and omit the modern labor problem which is throbbing and pulsating all about us? Are we giving a certain course because students ought to have it or because it happens to interest us very much personally?

The very soul of the college curriculum should be in the group of departments dealing with the world’s literature and the social sciences. And barring the department of English literature, the

department which should contribute most to the proper aims of college education is the economics department—or preferably the department which handles both economics and sociology. (Throughout this discussion I am going to assume that the same department controls the curriculum in both subjects.) The great problems of today are economic. Political science is the science of the machinery of government, but the matters with which that machinery has to do are economic and sociological; and not a little political science teaching in college is doctrinaire, and not a little civics teaching in high schools is deadly dry, because teachers are not sufficiently conversant with the economic and social life of which government is only a phase, though a most important phase, of control. So too in the field of ethics. No teacher of ethics is in a position to talk practically until he recognizes that there is an economic basis of social relations. Morality and productivity; morality and opportunity; morality and valuation; what a wealth of fecund connection between economics and ethics, now mostly overlooked on both sides because we are all so busy delving in some little corner of our own preserve. While the social science departments are the soul of the college, or should be, they will fail to utilize a glorious opportunity and to fulfil a most urgent duty if they go off after the false gods of either empty culture or uncultured commercialism.

Professor Patten, in his presidential address at the Atlantic City meeting of the American Economic Association, struck a pessimistic note about the lack of influence of economics on the public. Why the failure of a quarter-century of economics teachings to bring large results? Why have economists made so little impression? Why such droves of vicious economic fallacies about? Why the headlong individualism of the average American, and of many college men and women? Why so little real understanding of the economic functions of government, of legislative methods, of what government can and cannot do by legislation? Why are social science teachers sometimes gazed at askance by some of their colleagues in the more traditional departments? Is it because they suspect us of a “cursed modernism” and think us lacking in finer sensibility with regard to life’s values? *Do we*

make as much of our work as we should, from the humanistic point of view? *Have* we organized it with a sufficiently broad outlook, and adaptation to today's needs; or have we been prone to follow precedent, and so failed in part in vitality of interest and reality of utility? However this may be, we certainly now recognize that a considerable proportion of both college and high-school study as hitherto organized is lacking in permanent valuable result because it is really aimless, or planned on a basis suited to former times and conditions. Certainly one reason for the comparatively small result from social science teaching is that the high schools have been and are practically closed to these subjects. I do not wish to be taken as unduly pessimistic as to what our college social science departments have accomplished; and were Professor Patten speaking today, he would recognize that the three years that have elapsed since his presidential address have given much hope that the season of fruition to a quarter-century of teaching and discussing economic and social science is now at hand. My thought is simply that it is time for us to accomplish much more with the resources, the students, and the interest now at our disposal, and that we can enlarge and enliven our usefulness only by surveying our goal, our subject-matter, our students, and by planning an organized, integrated departmental curriculum accordingly. No one will dissent from this view, in theory probably, but it is my impression, gained mainly, I admit, from my own department and from a perusal of college catalogues, that the curricula of economics, sociology, and political science departments, are not planned with the needs of citizenship sufficiently in view, and that there is a woeful lack of co-ordination between these departments, and generally little sequence of courses designed to get somewhere.

There has been remarkable growth in attendance in economics and sociology courses. In Oberlin College, for instance, in the last twelve years, the average number of students in the department has risen from 69 to 368 and the "instruction units" (an instruction unit represents one student once a week for a semester) from 621 to 2,252. Similar figures of increase can be obtained from any college of any size or progressiveness. But the very rapidity

of this growth has tended to prevent the development of well wrought-out organization, by exhausting teachers' time and energy in the classroom. We must recognize the difficulties in the way of organizing an economics curriculum adapted to the rapidly shifting and developing needs of today. Among the obstacles to be surmounted are frequent changes of teachers, lack of teaching force, the strength of inertia, the necessity of pioneering, and the necessity of securing co-operation between different departments. But these are all conditions that can be overcome with time, application, and patience, provided we have the necessary vision.

With this general view of the educational situation as it has to do with the aim of the college and of economics teaching, we may now proceed to discuss the more specific principles which should guide us in the planning of a curriculum.

The choice of courses to be offered in the undergraduate curriculum is of the utmost importance. I believe that it has not usually been given enough thought. Certain undesirable tendencies should be guarded against, and certain positive principles of choice kept in mind. The choice should be determined, first, by the needs of training for social citizenship, second, by future vocational needs, and third, by the interests of general culture and discipline. The most important needs must be fulfilled first. This means that we should neither fill our curriculum with courses in theory and methodology nor turn it over entirely, or even preponderantly, to technical commercial and business courses; it means, too, that students shall be encouraged to elect courses in sequence, and certain sequences of courses.

Of the two dangers I think the danger of commercializing our departments is now the greater. I fear there is too strong a tendency at present to put very great emphasis on the commercial, business, money-making aspects of economics rather than on the ethical and social. Here is danger of getting away from the citizenship aim and from the deeper human values of our subjects. I may be in error in the feeling as to this tendency. I hope I am. And the danger in it, if it exists, depends largely on the spirit of the teachers. In spite of the great necessity for development of commercial education in this country, I feel that we need to guard it,

in the *undergraduate years*, very carefully. Where the idea of commercial education does enter strongly into undergraduate work, and even where it is a purely graduate or professional school course, I feel that it should include a carefully planned course in business ethics and commercial morality.

In the next place, we should be sure that the courses we offer are of sufficient breadth and that we are not giving them simply because they happen to interest us or because we are writing a book on the subject. We should avoid specialism. We ought to put particular emphasis on the fundamental courses—the elementary, general course in economics, the general course in political science, and, if it be a possibility, a really satisfactory and balanced general course in sociology. I object to the term “introductory course” and to the conception itself, when carried out literally. I remember that comparatively few students are going to be specialists in economics or sociology or political science. I know that many of them, with the demands their own chosen field of study and work makes upon them, cannot devote more than a year to economics; and I know furthermore that many give only a year to economics, sociology, and political science combined. This is unfortunate and raises the question whether a general course in social science should not be given. Personally I am not in favor of it, because it would necessarily be very much a skeleton, or superficial course, and I think it better to expect that students in the future will in greater numbers see the desirability of devoting at least three full courses to the social sciences.

As a teacher gets more and more interested in a subject, as he develops his course, the result too often is that he expands it from a semester to a year. No doubt from one point of view it is a better, a more thorough course, but from the point of view of conserving the student's time and not compelling him to delve with a specialist's expert detail into a subject of which neither culture nor discipline nor his life vocational career demand more than a survey, such extension is unfortunate. It should be remembered that I am speaking here solely of undergraduate courses. Not only does undue lengthening of courses waste the time of some students who elect them, but it shuts out

from these subjects many students who would be glad to get a valuable general survey if they could. General courses *should* be year courses, but specific courses, such as socialism, social psychology, or municipal government, should be kept to the half-year limit. Let the graduate school offer any desirable extensions.

We are in danger, also, of wanting to offer too many courses. At least two evils lurk in this tendency. We are in danger of introducing new courses without reference to a definite plan or aim for the department as a whole, and here again we are in danger of wasting students' time. The ideal should be to keep the citizenship aim always in view, to offer certain general courses, followed by certain broad courses in specific fields which contribute to that aim; and to offer a few courses (the number being dependent upon the teaching force and other resources) with a vocational tendency, so that the student's "life-career motive" may be appealed to and set to functionizing early in his college course.

The need of economizing the student's time and the consequent undesirability of allowing him to elect at will from a large number of detailed or specialized courses will suggest the fundamental necessity for a well-planned sequence of courses in any department which wishes to put its whole work into any organic relation to the general and ultimate aim of college education. The simple fact is that the student cannot take everything we offer. What then shall he take of what we do offer and in what order shall he be permitted or encouraged to take these courses? And if a student elects the fundamental course in our department should we permit him to go ahead to other courses in the same department irrespective of whether he has had the foundational courses in related departments? Where the departments are distinct, usually a student is permitted, or encouraged, to take courses in sociology whether he has economics or not. I have given that plan a thorough trial myself; but this year we have finally closed the last course which could be taken without previously having had elementary economics—the general course in sociological theory. I am more sociologist than economist, probably, but I hold it a distortion of social values to attempt to ground a student in sociological theory or to set him to studying the family, or charities,

or the race problem, before he has the basic training in economics. If he can take but one course in social science it should by all means be a broadly conceived, broadly taught course in general economics, and such a source is, in my opinion, by far the best foundation for a study of sociology or government. With regard to economics and political science the case is not so clear. We try to encourage students to elect the two general courses in these departments simultaneously, so far without much success, and we require all students majoring in economics to take the general course in government. The political science major also requires economics.

It is probably not possible to secure a really logical organization of courses without much more co-operation and co-ordination between related departments than in the present state of educational individualism we are likely to get. There should be, for instance, a much more intimate relation between the general courses in economics and the general course in government than now exists. The relation of the state to economic life, the importance and the processes of economic legislation, should be greatly emphasized in both. In economics courses, we are perhaps too much concerned with the need of reform and give too little consideration to the means. In government courses, the reverse is true; our friends, the political scientists, are too much concerned with the machinery, too little attentive to what the machinery is for or to the material that must go through it—the economic and industrial relations of today. Some recasting of these courses would bring large results for efficient citizenship. I cannot refrain from pointing out that departmental lines often prevent us from developing courses responsively adapted to the conditions and movements of the time and that students lose thereby. I think a course on methods of legislation and administration should be given, with practical citizenship and vocational ends in view; but I do not believe that either the average economics teacher or the average political science teacher, alone, is fitted to give such a course. Again I believe we should now offer a course in social hygiene; but to give such a course properly (unless you have a broad-horized specialist on your faculty) will require co-operation

between at least three different departments—hygiene, biology, and economics. It may be of interest to note, too, that more co-operation between departments might save duplication of the same subject in different departments, if this be desirable. I know that eugenics is being treated in at least four different courses in Oberlin, but there is no course giving an all-around and balanced view of the subject. The problem of securing closer relation between departments is, however, too large to be dealt with in this paper and I shall confine myself to our own departmental curriculum.

I have indicated my belief that choice of courses for our curriculum should (1) avoid an over-commercialized attitude, (2) avoid specialism, (3) avoid undue lengthening of courses, (4) economize students' time, (5) secure election of fundamental courses, (6) have reference to the curricula of related departments. I have indicated, too, that we must have a *planned* curriculum, not one that grows up by a process of the scholastic interests of instructors and professors.

The planning of the curriculum, aside from the guiding principles thus enumerated, involves two very important considerations: first, the courses must relate as nearly as may be to the life and interests and needs of today and tomorrow—not of yesterday; secondly, our courses must be arranged in some sort of sequence. My two underlying thoughts here are that there is no room in our social science departments for erudition for its own sake, and that some subjects are of such immensely greater importance than others, even those upon which we offer courses, that we cannot reasonably allow students to elect at will, or with only such haphazard and unsystematized prerequisites as college catalogues now suggest.

Our practice at Oberlin is to recommend that students who have had the elementary economics and who desire further work in the department should, in the second year, take either the year course in social problems or some one of the courses in applied economics, the choice to be determined by their general or their probable vocational interests. Students may also, by the Junior year, elect the year course in sociological theory but are encouraged to wait until their Senior year and to take, if possible, the social problems beforehand. We offer a full year course, and only one

course, in sociological theory, because we feel that to give less than a year to it would turn students away with an entirely superficial and partial view, and to give more than a year, or to split it into distinct courses on social psychology, etc., would mean that most students would get only a fragmentary view of what sociology involves. The course in social problems also, it is worth noting, is a year course, and deals not with charity, or social settlements, or the condition of farm laborers in Oklahoma; but with population, immigration, eugenics, marriage and divorce, the woman problem and the race problem—to which I expect to add one or two other problems this year. For students whose interests tend toward distinctly economic problems, we offer courses in money and banking, transportation and industrial corporations, taxation and public finance. These all correspond to very definite needs and problems. We also offer a course in economic theory, with special emphasis on distribution. Two courses, one on labor problems and one on socialism, which we have had to abandon on account of the pressure of our expanding elementary class, we shall certainly reinstate in the very near future. I have already indicated my opinion that a course in economic and social legislation and administration, and one on public health or social hygiene, should be given; and I hope eventually to see both installed in Oberlin. I believe both courses urgently needed to contribute to efficient citizenship. My own feeling is also that even in an undergraduate department a simple course in statistics should be offered, mainly because the statistical method is growing in importance and because we need to try to help in the development of statistical experts as well as to give to the average citizen some capacity for the interpretation of statistical information. We shall probably maintain a course in economic history of the United States but I confess to feeling some doubt concerning the real utility of such a course, unless it aims to show constantly the relation between our economic development and our political history—a relation which none of our textbooks as yet satisfactorily treat. Such a course would require both expert economic knowledge and wide and philosophic acquaintance with political and social history—a combination of attainments to which few men can honestly lay claim.

It may be noted that the basis for choice in all this is the perspective in which we see citizenship and to some extent vocational needs of today. Others have a different perspective, and I am not offering our curriculum, present and prospective, as a model in detail, but simply as a suggestion of how we are trying to apply our own theory of curriculum-planning and departmental organization.

The elementary course is broad enough to suffice for those who cannot take more economics; I am seeking to broaden its stimulating quality still more, by leaving the heavy work to the section meetings, and devoting the lectures (now only one a week) to the wider aspects of social and political economy. This broader civic and humanistic aim underlies the social problems course too, which attempts to deal, as I have suggested, with the really great problems of the time, and not simply with specific social conditions and merely ameliorative or palliative remedies. It is possible that in a similar manner the distinctly economic problems of the time may call for an advanced course, dealing, in a broad way, with poverty and its causes, the tariff, tax administration, methods of increasing productivity (scientific management, etc.), agricultural economics, municipal and government ownership, etc. This would be a course for those who want more study of these matters than can be had in elementary economics, but who do not wish to elect the detailed courses in taxation, transportation, etc. We have taken no step to work out such a course, and I do not know that it would find a real place.

It will be noted that some points are not touched in this rough survey; for instance, I have not mentioned the history of the family, or charities and corrections, nor have I enumerated detailed courses in immigration or municipal sanitation or the boy problem or municipal accounting. Some courses are too detailed for undergraduate work and others can better be offered by the technical schools. For instance, I believe a course in charities and corrections can better be offered by the schools of philanthropy than by the college.

The specific courses offered by a department may, however, properly be chosen somewhat with reference to the location of the

college. For instance, our plan of courses in Oberlin differs in important respects from the plan followed in the sociology department at Western Reserve University and this for the reason that Western Reserve is situated in a large city, calls most of its students from that one city, and properly aims to orientate and instruct them in the specific social problems and conditions into which they will nearly all at once go upon graduation. In Oberlin, on the other hand, we draw our students from all over the country, many from small towns as well as the cities; and they scatter widely to many regions and many spheres of life. I have thought it better, consequently, considering our student body and our geographical location, not to attempt specialization on city problems, however desirable that specialization may be from some points of view, but to seek rather to ground as many of our students as elect our advanced courses in the great widespread, deepseated problems, economic and social, of our time. I believe that in the long run this policy will not only produce sound cultural and citizenship values but will be conducive to efficiency even in the specialized fields of social service where more specific courses in urban or rural sociology might seem, at first thought, indispensable.

There is one particular in which I feel that economics and sociology departments everywhere are glaringly at fault. That is the tendency we undoubtedly have to look at our problems of aim and content from the point of view of men and not of women. Personally I have tried to guard against this tendency as much as practicable, but I am sure that as yet we have failed to sense the needs of women, in so far as they differ from those of men. I should feel worse about this if I belonged to that school of thought which deems the interests and future social spheres of men and women radically different. I do not. I do not think, therefore, that the educational curricula for men and for women must necessarily differ radically to be effective. I do think, however, that in co-educational institutions we should probably offer at least one course in economics dealing with the specific economic conditions and functions of women. In this connection I may note that we have just appointed a vocational secretary for women at Oberlin, in the hope of reducing the percentage of women who go through

college with no real aim, and who then, to the number of about 60 per cent of the women graduating each year, drift into teaching for lack of knowing what else to do. Because of this tendency, our college course for women has been, in my opinion, largely a vocational course, badly organized for girls who will teach classics, English, and history. In no single action taken in years do I think there has been larger promise of gain than in the appointment of this vocational adviser for women. We now need one for men; and we are at work on a system of vocational majors.

As time goes on the economics department desires to start a teachers' training course, either independently or more probably in co-operation with the political science department. I am well aware that economics is not much taught in high schools; but it ought to be, and I know of no better way to help it along there than to start a supply of college-trained men and women who not only have had college courses in economics, sociology, and political science, but have also had general courses in educational theory and practice, and have, in this economics and government training course, had their attention definitely called to the utility of economics in secondary education, and to the methods and problems of its presentation there. I do not want the best things—the significant studies for our age—reserved for a few college students; nor do I wish to see continued the unjust outrage of foisting upon high schools, as teachers, students just out of college, whose chief criterion and ideal of teaching is to give high-school students a rehash of college courses and college methods. Here, I think, is another neglected duty on the part of college departments of economics and government.

I realize that the program of organization, adaptation, and co-operation I have suggested will meet with many concrete difficulties. The troubles of the college teacher, especially if he be responsible for the organization and development of a department, are many. He is confronted with many questions of organization and material equipment, of securing a proper number of teachers suitably trained, of library facilities, and by many lesser problems. *And for meeting these problems his graduate instruction has ordinarily*

given him no direct preparation whatever. He has been kept at the subject-matter of his field—be it economics or Indic philology—with his nose to the thesis-grindstone. He is trained for research, not for teaching. The result is reflected in the lack of a pedagogical sense on the part of many college teachers. Comparatively few college teachers, in my observation, are spontaneously inclined to consider critically educational values or methods. At the outset, the new teacher, raw from a graduate school and without independent experience, is very likely to give his main attention to the academic content of his specific course and to fail to refer his work constantly to the student's experience and future career or to the work of the college as a whole. He is sometimes much inclined to regard "publication" as the only badge of scholarship, and to attach more importance to developing the technical details of our specific courses than to working into them a vitality of interest and utility. Just as the college student going out to high-school teaching very often simply carries with him, disastrously, the ideals and methods of his college course, so the young college teacher, coming fresh from the academic and sometimes scholastic atmosphere and methods of the graduate school, is prone to carry his graduate notions into his undergraduate teaching. With the very numerous exceptions that must always be accorded any generalization about persons, college teachers tend in some very important particulars to be non-democratic, and hence fail to perceive the necessity for revising their educational notions to fit this new alert and vigorous democracy of ours. The graduate school has not trained its student in democracy and to democracy. In a sense this student is a selected person working among the select. Moreover he is a specialist, very often with the narrow interests of a specialist, and without real vision of the *meaning* of his specialty. In other words, he lacks educational horizon. He does not try to make a vital connection between his subject and his students' life-needs. He demands that students take this connection on faith. He is a formal disciplinarian, a believer in "the cultured gentleman" ideal of college purpose. He consequently opposes—if he takes any position at all—the introduction of the vocational motive in college education. I have come

to feel strongly that the graduate preparation of teachers of the social sciences needs considerable overhauling; that less time may properly be required on thesis work and that the time thus saved should be devoted to a careful consideration of just those broad and specific pedagogical and educational matters which our conferences of economic teachers lately have aimed to deal with. Every graduate student going into teaching should have had at least one course in educational theory, by all means; and in addition should have had at least a few lectures on the concrete problems and situations he will meet in his own department. I realize that only actual experience has been the real and ultimate teacher of any of us, but I believe that all of us could have come into these problems with a more vivid and intelligent appreciation of their character and importance; and that as we now give careful consideration to them, and as graduate students now and in the future have their attention clearly turned to them, our social science curricula will be more perfectly adapted to the citizenship, the cultural, and the vocational needs of college students.

A. B. WOLFE

OBERLIN COLLEGE